



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/600,957	06/20/2003	Garth Powis	126387.530	6628
7590	08/24/2007		EXAMINER	
Pepper Hamilton LLP One Mellon Center, 50th Floor 500 Grant Street Pittsburgh, PA 15219			FETTEROLF, BRANDON J	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1642	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/24/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/600,957	POWIS, GARTH	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD	1642	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 07 June 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-10 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-6 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 7-10 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to the Amendment

The Amendment filed on 6/07/2007 in response to the previous Non-Final Office Action (6/27/2007) is acknowledged and has been entered.

Claims 1-9 are pending.

Claims 1-6 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions.

Claims 7-10 are currently under consideration.

Rejections Withdrawn:

The rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement is withdrawn in view of Applicants amendments.

The rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Mau et al. Biochemical Pharmacology 1992; 43 (7): 1613-1620, *IDS* is withdrawn in view of Applicants amendments.

Rejections Maintained:

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 7-8 remain provisionally rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1, 4, 5 and 7 of copending Application No. 10/617,949.

Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because a species anticipates a genus. The species composition comprising an asymmetric disulfide or derivative thereof, wherein said asymmetric disulfide is an inhibition of thioredoxin or thioredoxin reductase claimed in the conflicting patent application appears to fall within the same scope of the genus composition comprising an agent that is useful in reducing or eliminating thioredoxin associated apoptosis inhibition claimed in the application being examined.

This is a provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

In response to this rejection, Applicants contend that a terminal disclaimer has been submitted with this response. However, the Examiner recognizes that a terminal disclaimer does not appear to be part of the record. As such, the rejection is maintained.

New Rejections Necessitated by Amendment:

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. THIS IS A NEW MATTER REJECTION.

Claims 7-8 have been amended to recite the limitation “pharmaceutically” acceptable carrier. However, the limitation “pharmaceutically” has no clear support in the specification and the claims as originally filed. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the response to this Office Action. Alternatively, applicant is invited to provide sufficient written support for the “limitation” indicated above. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06

Moreover, new claims 9-10 recite the limitation “said 2-imidazoyl disulfide compound is 1-methylpropyl-2-imidazoyl disulfide”. However, while the specification provides support for the genus, unsymmetrical 2-imidazoyl disulfides (paragraph 0131), the limitation “1-methylpropyl-2-imidazoyl disulfide” has no clear support in the specification and the claims as originally filed. Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the response to this Office Action. Alternatively, applicant is invited to provide sufficient written support for the “limitation” indicated above. See MPEP 714.02 and 2163.06

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 7-10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oblong et al. (Cancer Chemotherapy and Pharmacology 1994; 34: 434-438, *IDS*) as evidenced by Ashburn (US 20070010543, 2007).

Oblong et al. teach a composition comprising an agent in DMSO, wherein the agent acts as a reversible inhibitor of human thioredoxin (page 435, 1st column, *TR assay*, page 436, 1st column, 1st full paragraph and Title). With regards to the thioredoxin inhibitor, the reference teaches that the thioredoxin inhibitors are alkyl 2-imidazole disulfide analogues, such as 1-methylpropyl-2-imidazoyl disulfide (Title and page 435, 1st column, *Chemicals* and Fig. 1). Moreover, the reference teaches that the alkyl 2-imidazoyl disulfide analogues are useful at inhibiting cellular proliferation, e.g. cell growth (page 437, Fig. 4A,B and 2nd column, last paragraph). Thus, while Oblong et al. do not explicitly teach that the agent is useful in reducing or eliminating thioredoxin-associated apoptosis

inhibition, the intended use of the compound must result in a structural difference between the claimed invention and the prior art in order to patentably distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art. If the prior art structure is capable of performing the intended use, then it meets the claim. A composition is a composition irrespective of what its intended use is. See In re Tuominen, 213 USPQ 89 (CCPA 1982). Secondly, although Oblong et al. does not explicitly teach that DMSO is a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, the claimed limitation does not appear to result in a manipulative difference when compared to the prior arts disclosure because as evidenced by Ashburn, DMSO is an example of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (paragraph 0049). Thus the claimed composition appears to be the same as the prior art.

Note: In order to expedite prosecution, the Examiner would like to respond to Applicants arguments pertaining to the previous rejection of claims 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Oblong et al. (Cancer Chemotherapy and Pharmacology 1994; 34: 434-438, *IDS*) as they relate to the instant rejection. In response to the previous rejection, Applicants assert that Oblong et al. does not disclose a 2-imidazolyl disulfide and a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier.

These arguments have been carefully considered, but are not found persuasive.

In response to Applicants assertions that Oblong does not teach the claimed invention, the Examiner Oblong et al. teach alkyl 2-imidazole disulfide analogues in a DMSO solution which are inhibitors of thioredoxin. In particular, Oblong et al. teach an alkyl-2-imidazole analog referred to as 1-methylpropyl-2-imidazolyl disulfide which appears to be identical to the claimed 2-imidazolyl disulfide claimed in claims 9-10. Thus, as noted above, although Oblong et al. does not explicitly teach that DMSO is a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier, the claimed limitation does not appear to result in a manipulative difference when compared to the prior arts disclosure because as evidenced by Ashburn, DMSO is an example of a pharmaceutically acceptable carrier (paragraph 0049). As such, the claimed composition appears to be the same as the prior art.

All other rejections and/or objections are withdrawn in view of applicant's amendments and arguments there to.

Conclusion

Therefore, No claim is allowed.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brandon J. Fetterolf, PhD whose telephone number is (571)-272-2919. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 7:30 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Shanon Foley can be reached on 571-272-0898. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Brandon J Fetterolf, PhD
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 1642

BF


SHANON FOLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

